

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

'Some tymes J have a shillinge aday, and some tymes nothings, so that J leve in great poverty': British actors in the paintings of Frans Hals

Book Section

How to cite:

Katritzky, M.A. (2007). 'Some tymes J have a shillinge aday, and some tymes nothings, so that J leve in great poverty': British actors in the paintings of Frans Hals. In: Nichols, Tom ed. Others and Outcasts in Early Modern Europe: Picturing the Social Margins. UK: Ashgate, pp. 197–214.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© [\[not recorded\]](#)

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<https://www.ashgate.com/shopping/title.asp?key1=&key2=&orig=results&isbn=0%207546%205557%201>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

**'Some tymes J have a shillinge aday, and some tymes
nothings, so that J leve in great poverty': British Actors in
the Paintings of Frans Hals¹**

M. A. Katritzky

From the mid-sixteenth century, touring troupes of Italian actors brought the *commedia dell'arte* to courts and marketplaces all over Europe. For a half-century from the 1580s, English troupes regularly crossed the channel, where their most lucrative European destinations were the trade fairs and courts of the German-speaking regions, often via The Netherlands. From the 1590s, Robert Browne, later joined by his son-in-law Robert Reynolds and John Green, essentially co-led the European operations of Philip Henslowe and Edward Alleyn's London-based theatrical empire. After the Thirty Years War, its leadership passed to John Wade, William Roe and Roe's son-in-law George Jolly, whose many European aliases included that of 'Gideon Gellius', and who took on the role of a troupe-leading 'Pickelhering' (stage fool) throughout the 1650s. Together with other itinerants such as 'Juglers Pedlars Tynkers and Petye Chapmen', such 'Comon Players' were legally classified within the lowest strata of society, as 'Roges Vacabundes and Sturde Beggars' in the London 1572 *Acte for the punishement of Vacabondes and for Releif of the Poore and Impotent*.² Most European states vigorously enforced equivalent legislation. A letter from a member of Browne's troupe, Richard Jones, to Alleyn offers some insight into the economic deprivations that could be experienced by touring English players:

m^r allen J commend my love and humble duty to you geving you thanks for yo^r great bounty bestoed vpon me in my sicknes, when J was in great want, god blese you fo^r it, sir this it is, J am to go over beyond the seeas w^t m^r browne and the company but not by his meanes for he is put to half a shaer, and to stay hear, for they ar all against his goinge... now good sir as you have ever byne my worthie frend so heelp me nowe J have asut of clothes and acloke at pane [pawn] fo^r three pound and if it shall pleas

you to lend me so much to release them J shalbe bound to pray fo^r you so longe as J leve, for if J go over and have no clothes J shall not be esteemed of and by gode help the first mony that J gett J will send it over vnto you, fo^r hear J get nothinge, some tymes J have a shillinge aday, and some tymes nothinge, so that J leve in great poverty hear, and so J humbly take my leave prainge to god J and my wiffe for yo^r health and mistris allenes w^{ch} god continew, / Yo^r poor frend to command / Richard Jones³

Historians of their activities unanimously base their accounts of them squarely on textual documentation. The early *commedia dell'arte* has inspired an immense visual record, ranging from ephemeral and popular art to works by artists of the first rank. In contrast, the rarity of accepted images linked with the activities of the English players in Europe is such that few theatre historians would argue with the assertion that there are 'very few extant iconographical documents depicting English actors on the continent. Although there are a number of interesting parallels between the English players and their Italian counterparts, a striking difference is the iconographical blackout pertaining to the English actors'.⁴ My own increasing uneasiness with this view stems from a re-assessment of some previously insufficiently recognized sources for visual records of English players. I here suggest that these include certain paintings by Frans Hals, and examine the possibility that his oeuvre includes portraits of touring English actors.

The perceived 'iconographical blackout' is starkly demonstrated by the relative quantity of pre-1650 images of the *commedia dell'arte* stock stage fool Harlequin, and of Shakespeare's Hamlet, a role acted in Europe by the English players from the 1620s. Nicoll sharply contrasts our ability to visualize these two most universally known theatrical characters: 'no one could describe what [Hamlet] looks like; Harlequin's appearance we could immediately present in detail'.⁵ While numerous pictures of Harlequin can be authoritatively dated to within the lifetime of Harlequin's creator Tristano Martinelli (1557–1630), only a single image pre-dating 1650 has ever been linked with Shakespeare's Hamlet. Moreover, this painting has been assessed neither with detailed reference to the English actors in Europe, nor to a group of portraits in which its artist depicts the English players' rival to Harlequin, their stage fool Pickelhering. If scholarly sources offer scant pickings concerning the appearance of Shakespeare's Hamlet, popular publications favour an altogether more robust approach. They routinely reproduce authentic Elizabethan and Jacobean documents jostling with images of historically genuine actors and actresses in Shakespearean roles, and a myriad of less easily theatrically definable Shakespeare-inspired images. Every last Hamlet among the illustrations of one such publication is by a modern artist.⁶ Chronologically, they range from Anthelme François Lagrenée's early nineteenth-century portrait of the actor Joseph Talma as Hamlet, two of Eugene Delacroix's magnificent Hamlets, and Sir John Gilbert's Hamlet of 1849, to sadly feeble Hamlets of 1875 and



9.1 Frans Hals, *Young Man with a Skull (vanitas)*, c. 1626–28, oil on canvas, 92 × 81 cm

1883 by Ladislav von Czachorski and Pascal Dagnan-Bouveret. One painting conspicuous by its absence is *Young Man with a Skull*, by Frans Hals (c. 1580–1666), who was born 16 years after Shakespeare and outlived him by exactly half a century (Figure 9.1).

As well as his wealthy and successful official sitters, the great Dutch portraitist habitually sought out non-paying sitters at the margins of society. Some of his most penetrating and spontaneous works depict those condemned to poverty through old age, youth or the pursuit of low-paying, often socially marginalized occupations. One of the largest of these latter groups

was itinerants. Just the merest whiskery fluff ruffles the cheeks of his *Young Man with a Skull*. The youthful energy radiating from his fresh open face is accentuated by his pert red feathered cap and by his gesturing right hand, which appears to seek out the spectator, wherever he chooses to stand. The sitter's liveliness contrasts with a skull of exceptional decrepitude, without its lower jaw and most of its teeth. The vivid flesh-coloured cap-feather vigorously links the living sitter, whose flesh tones dominate the upper part of the picture, to the dull greys and muted russets of the skull-dominated lower part. Painted less than two decades after Shakespeare's death, earlier generations of Shakespearean scholars were delighted to hail its skull as that of Yorick, and the young man holding the iconic stage prop as the earliest depiction of an actor in the role of Hamlet. This identification, which goes back to when the painting was catalogued as *Hamlet with Yorick's Skull* (1806), then *Hamlet Prince of Denmark, Moralising on the Skull of Yorick* (1815), has been accorded a resoundingly negative reception by modern specialists.⁷ The National Gallery has dropped all reference to Hamlet, and the painting is dismissively footnoted by Young, for whom 'the earliest visual rendition of Hamlet with Yorick's skull was a 1773 engraving by John Hall'.⁸ Slive has championed the current acceptance of 'the so-called Hamlet' as nothing more than a typical *vanitas* composition.⁹ He dates the painting to the late 1620s, and places it firmly within a strong Flemish visual tradition dating back to at least 1516, when Lucas van Leyden produced an engraving of the same title. Concerning possible Shakespearean connections, Slive notes that 'Bode-Binder and Valentiner correctly expressed laconic reservations regarding this ... Borenus and Hodgson were sceptical ... as well'. Noting that 'there is no evidence that a work by Shakespeare was ever performed in Holland or translated into Dutch in Hals's time', he concludes of the painting's sitter that 'it is hardly probable that he represents Hamlet'.

There is nothing absolutely impossible in the suggestion that Hals may have been inspired by a strolling player's performance of the character in Shakespeare's play, but... this hardy Netherlandish pictorial tradition supports the conclusion that the skull held by the boy in Hals' painting is meant as a reminder of the transience of life and the certainty of death, and that the picture was intended as a *vanitas*.¹⁰

The *vanitas* tradition is overtly acknowledged by Hals himself, for example in *Portrait of a 60-Year-Old Man holding a Skull*, one of his very earliest portraits.¹¹ By the seventeenth century, Dutch painters liked to incorporate favourite *vanitas* motifs (such as skulls, smoke, bubbles, snuffed-out candles and spent pipes) into their works in a matter-of-fact way that allows them to be enjoyed on a purely realistic level, as more or less plausible reflections of everyday life. So, evidently, did Shakespeare. *Hamlet*, of all his plays the one that most relentlessly addresses theatricality, human transience and

the inevitability of death, may be read as an extended *vanitas*, culminating in the graveyard scene, and specifically in Hamlet's confrontation with the skull of Yorick. Indisputably, both *Young Man with a Skull* and Shakespeare's *Hamlet* merit their place in the *vanitas* tradition. Given Hals's known working methods, his subject is unlikely to be an abstract personification rather than a genuine portrait of a specific individual. His sitter, holding this blatantly 'chopfalne'¹² and grubby skull, is not preoccupied with solitary introspection, but with striking a memorable pose. The classic Hamlet pose of declaiming, skull in hand, is based on post-Shakespearean stage directions. But acting and music were considered fitting subjects of the self-conscious *vanitas* tradition, whose concerns (transience and mortality) are especially compatible with theatricality.

Could Hals, rather than producing 'a painting that secedes from its own creative particularity for a belatedness that renders it merely a visual corollary to Shakespeare's play',¹³ here be consciously seeking to enhance his visual reflection of the artistic *vanitas* tradition by direct reference to *Hamlet*? The painting's theatrical pretensions, essentially punctured by the rejection of the traditional identification of its sitter as Hamlet, have been revived by recognition of his gestures and costume as those of an actor. But the low societal status of the English itinerants has been used to rule them out as the subjects of such a monumental painting, and to point instead to identification with an amateur Dutchman from a Rederijkerskamer,¹⁴ such as the Haarlem 'De Wijngaardranken' to which Hals belonged during the years 1616–24.¹⁵ The possibility that this sitter was an English professional – perhaps even in the role of Hamlet – warrants serious attention because Frans Hals had a proven interest in depicting performing marginals, and he had ample opportunities to observe and meet visiting English players, both in his birthplace of Antwerp during the first two decades of his life, and in and around Haarlem, his home from 1600. Slive was aware of only one visit to Holland by travelling English actors before Hals painted *Young Man with a Skull*.¹⁶ In fact, during Hals' lifetime, there is documentary evidence for numerous performances by English troupes, including at least one whose repertoire included *Hamlet*, in towns all over The Netherlands, and prominent English troupe leaders permanently settled their families and households close to his home town of Haarlem.¹⁷

The Englishman Fynes Moryson, whose travels took him to the Frankfurt Fair in September 1592, confirms their precarious beginnings. He disparages the 'stragling broken Companyes' of touring British players: 'some of our cast dispised Stage players came out of England into Germany, and played at Franckford in the tyme of the mart, hauing nether a complete number of Actors, nor any good apparell, nor any ornament of the Stage'. He takes a jaded view of their efforts, describing them as 'peeeces and Patches of English playes,

which my selfe and some English men there present could not heare without great wearysomenes'.¹⁸ But a German spectator at this same fair reminds us that Europeans viewed them very differently. Writing on 13 September 1592 from the Frankfurt Fair to his wife Magdalena Behaim, Balthasar Paumgartner enthusiastically praised Robert Browne's troupe of ten or twelve performers. Their music, acrobatics and dancing excelled any he had ever previously heard or seen, and their costumes struck the Nürnberg cloth merchant as impressive and costly. On 17 September 1592, Magdalena replies: 'I would most gladly have watched the English performance and players of whom you wrote'.¹⁹

By the early seventeenth century, Dutch playwrights felt economically threatened by the extent of their activities and popularity. Bredero, for example, in around 1615, admonishes the local Amsterdam women for deserting his plays in favour of those of the visiting Englishmen, and Dutch theologians such as Voetius warned their parishioners against going to see the professional players.²⁰ At least one of the troupes that visited The Netherlands in the 1620s had demonstrably added *Hamlet* to its repertoire within three years of publication of the folio edition in 1623. This was the renowned troupe of John Green, who had performed in Utrecht in July 1620, and in Ghent in April 1624.²¹ *Hamlet*, absent from detailed records of Green's 1608 Austrian tour, is named in the repertory of his 1626 Dresden season.²² *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, a late eighteenth-century German version of *Hamlet*, has been widely hailed as a more reliable reflection of productions by English troupes in Europe from the 1620s onwards than any of the three earliest published versions of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. First published in the late eighteenth century, and said to be based on a unique (now lost) manuscript of a script of 1710 that had belonged to German touring actors, it has inspired Shakespeare scholars to heroic flights of imagination. Despite its uncertain provenance and late date, many scholars hailed this text as a Shakespearean equivalent to Goethe's *Ur-Faust*. According to them, it is based neither on Shakespeare's 1623 folio nor the 1603 or 1604/05 quarto *Hamlets*, but directly on a lost version of around 1590, perhaps by Thomas Kyd or the youthful Shakespeare, that some thought to be the *Hamlet* performed by English troupes on the continent.²³ However, it has so many stylistic features consistent with its eighteenth-century provenance that it is impossible to establish the individual minutiae of any meaningful relation to earlier performance practice. The fact that this *Hamlet* has no graveyard scene and no skulls is no more relevant to the staging of *Hamlet* in early seventeenth-century Holland than the fact that its play within a play is represented by actresses as well as actors. Its existence does not stand in the way of any version of *Hamlet* seen by Hals being performed complete with gravediggers and skulls.

If *Young Man with a Skull* (Figure 9.1) is a portrait of an English actor, then it seems likely that Hals also portrayed other English actors. Gudlaugsson's



9.2 Frans Hals, *So-Called Mulatto*, oil on canvas, 75.5 × 64 cm

pioneering theatre-iconographical researches reclaimed the stage connections of two works associated with Hals, a *Merry Trio* and the Kassel *Peeckelhaering*.²⁴ *Peeckelhaering*, a *So-Called Mulatto* in Leipzig (Figure 9.2), and their variants, generally dated to the same period as *Young Man with a Skull*, the late 1620s, all depict the same sitter.²⁵ He is a swarthy male in a theatrical red costume, with bright yellow trim and a row of distinctive large red pom-pom buttons down

its front. His identity, suggested by the first line of a verse inscribed on an engraved copy of *Peeckelhaering*: 'Siet Monsieur Peeckelhaering an', is lent a high degree of authenticity by several factors. The engraver, Jonas Suyderhoef, lived from c. 1613 to 1686, and is thought to have been commissioned by Hals himself to copy his paintings, and Hals is named as the artist of a portrait of Pickelhering in an auction catalogue of 1631.²⁶ In contrast to *Young Man with a Skull*, these portraits' theatrical credentials are undisputed since Gudlaugsson identified their sitters as northern performers, and they are routinely identified as 'a stock type in contemporary Dutch farces', or as Dutch rhetoricians (amateur actors).²⁷

Popular stage clowns often attracted imitators who adopted their stage name within, or more usually after, the lifetime of their creators. Like the Italian Harlequin, Pickelhering became, during the course of the seventeenth century, a generic stock role. Although the identities of many actors who created clowns are known, controversy surrounds Pickelhering's origins as a stage role. Bruegel's *Fight between Carnival and Lent* and a host of lesser images demonstrate the herring's venerable iconographic links with carnival practice, not least through the astrological sign for February and for some, Pickelhering has been 'known as a carnival clown or quack's assistant since the Middle Ages'.²⁸ Others suggest or imply that he is a social type, clown or stock theatrical role who originated in Holland itself, perhaps inspired by Pieter Cornelisz van der Morsch, portrayed by Hals in 1616 while wielding a kipper in his role as Piero, the stage fool of the Leyden rhetoricians 'De Witte Accoleijen'.²⁹ Most theatre historians are agreed that the role was created in Europe by an English actor, during the second decade of the seventeenth century.³⁰ This is supported by a German chronicle of 1631, that dates the introduction of the stage role Pickelhering into Germany to shortly before the start of the Thirty Years War (1618), by English actors.³¹ A pirated version of the English troupes' playtexts, many featuring Pickelhering, was published in 1620 and 1624.³² From then on, Pickelhering gained in popularity as a stage name, eventually establishing himself as the most popular stage character of the English troupes in Europe – the comic scene-stealer of their shows. One of the 'Boertigheden' of J. Starter's *Friesche Lust-Hof*, published in Amsterdam in 1621, sings with the voice of 'Peckelharing'; A. von Buchell watched a Pickelhering perform in Holland in 1629; and the role is alluded to in several Haarlem publications of around the time Hals painted the portraits.³³ One is Andreas Valerius's 1626 collection of theatrical jigs, some still in the original English, which includes 'Pots hondert duysent of Almande Pekelharing'.³⁴ Another is a free translation of Boxhorn's Latin poem 'Halecis salsati vires' patriotically praising Holland's most characteristic export, 'den ghesouten Haringh', published as 'Lof van den Pekelharingh' in Jacob Westerbaen's *Minne-Dichten* of 1633.³⁵ By the 1650s, Pickelhering features indiscriminately

on the playbills of touring companies of every level of competence, all over German-speaking Europe.

Robert Reynolds is the actor-manager traditionally identified as the creator of the stage role Pickelhering. Indisputably, Reynolds' troupe included a Pickelhering. 'Der Churf. Drl. in Sachsen Engellendischen comedianten, welche sich des bieklingherings compagnia nennen', which petitioned to play in Nürnberg on 30 July 1627, is surely the 'kurfürstlich sächsische englische Komödianten' led by Reynolds to Cologne in May 1628, as is the English troupe with a Pickelhering in Prague 1627–28.³⁶ The seventeen-year-old Archduchess Maria Anna, writing to her younger brother on 5 January 1628, suggests that it was not yet a generic stage role in the late 1620s:

On Sunday [9 Jan] we will dine in the King's castle [in Prague], after the meal the English will perform a play there as it isn't possible in this castle. I'm told they are very vulgar, and no comparison to the Italians ... I'm told they have a fool named 'bickelharing', he is, I'm told, the best, I think he is an exceptionally good fool.³⁷

Reynolds' own claim to the role is critically undermined by the use, as early as May 1615 in Wolfenbüttel, of the stage alias 'Pickelhering' by George Vincent.³⁸ Schrickx concludes that by 1620 Vincent had returned to Britain for good to tour the provinces.³⁹ However, the post-1620 English records that he cites relate not to George Vincent, but to the conjurer and impresario William Vincent who, with his troupe of rope-dancers and other entertainers, toured the British provinces from 1619 (or even earlier) to at least 1642, under the stage name 'Hocus Pocus'. Neither European tours nor connections to George Vincent have been noted for him, and little is known of his family connections beyond the death of two of his infant children Margaret and James in May 1632, and his own probable date of death, shortly before 1650.⁴⁰

George Vincent's membership of John Green's troupe is confirmed by documents such as one of 25 August 1615 in which Green, having already performed in Danzig for four weeks, petitions to play for a further month, citing the high cost of bringing his troupe from Wolfenbüttel.⁴¹ Notable among several documents supporting long-term connections between Pickelhering and Green's troupe is a broadsheet of 1621 claiming that 'Pickelhering' had also played 'Niemand', the role at the heart of Green's 1607–08 Graz repertoire.⁴² The coloured frontispiece drawing of Green's signed presentation copy to the Graz court of his own personal adaptation of *Nobody and Somebody* depicts 'Niemand' as a bearded redhead, routinely identified as Green.⁴³ That Green's troupe then included at least one genuine redhead is confirmed by Archduchess Maria Magdalena. Her 'theatre letter' of 1608 from Graz notes 'the one with long red hair who's always playing his little fiddle'.⁴⁴ Whether or not Pickelhering or 'Niemand' were played by, or as, redheads, the possibility that Vincent played both roles in Green's troupe is not ruled out

by the 1627 Torgau accommodation list's separate entries for two players, as 'Pickelheringk' and 'Der Rothkopf'.⁴⁵ Reynolds, a colleague of Vincent who did not survive him, is so unlikely to have shared or assumed his stage name, that despite his longstanding traditional association with the role, he may be ruled out as a possible Pickelhering.

Pickelhering's commercial undertakings are illuminated by two broadsheets of 1621. Among the earliest of numerous seventeenth-century images based on the role, their depictions of Pickelhering as an iron merchant may allude to George Vincent's arms-dealing.⁴⁶ In strong contrast to their early seventeenth-century rivals, French and Italian travelling actors, the commercial interests of the English players were not primarily medical. Rather than practising as quacks, significant numbers of English players pursued non-medical commercial interests, dealing in anything from arms, metal, cloth, luxury goods or musical instruments to livestock, or the importation and training of English performers, whether boys or adults, for the European market. George Vincent built up long-term connections – both theatrical and commercial – with the court of Poland, importing goods and performers from at least 1617, when he was in Warsaw with Green's troupe.⁴⁷ London Privy Council passes permitted him to bring to Warsaw in 1617, eight 'musicians' including Richard Jones and the boy-player John Wade (b. 1607), and in August 1618:

... to retourne into Poland, to the Prince, his master, and to take over with him such things as he hath bought for the Kinge, Queene and Prince of Poland, vizt. A perfumed sweete bagge and two bever hattes, one wastcot and foure paire of rich gloves, six wastcotts and six night capps, a dozen of [ryding] gloves and such instrumentes of musicke as he shall have use of for his maister's service, together with his wife and childrenn and also five musitians for the service of the Prince of Poland, and the wife of one Joanes residing in Poland.⁴⁸

Richard Jones' wife Haris evidently stayed across the channel for some time, as she wrote to Edward Alleyn from Danzig in April 1620 of her plan to join her husband, then 'with the prince'.⁴⁹ Jones, whose correspondence with Alleyn is quoted above, had been with Brown on the tour of 1592 seen by Moryson. By 1622, he was no longer in Poland, but with the court of Duke Philip Julius of Pommern-Wolgast. In a letter of 10 July 1624 requesting the Duke to take him back into his service, he blames his decision to return to London in 1623 on his fellow countryman 'Jürgen', who has been identified as George Vincent.⁵⁰

The English merchant and traveller Peter Mundy saw Pickelhering perform while he was a resident in Danzig from 1641 to 1647:

Some Summers come here⁵¹ our English commediens or players which representte in Netherlandische Dutche, having bin at Coninxberg⁵² beffore the prince Elector of Brandenburge. Allsoe att Warsowe beffore the king off Poland. Among those Actors was one here Nicknamed pickled herring, much talked off and admired

For his dexterity in the Jesters partt: Amo. [...] Hee died att Warsow. His wiffe now liveth here in towne. Hath allowance From the king For her Maynetenance.⁵³

In conflating George 'Pickelhering' Vincent with William 'Hocus Pocus' Vincent, Schrickx erroneously truncated George's continental career at 1620 and ruled out identification of him as Mundy's 'Pickled Herring', generally identified as Robert Reynolds.⁵⁴ From 1629, Reynolds' home was Den Haag, where his wife's presence is documented throughout the 1640s.⁵⁵ It was George Vincent's wife who followed her husband to Poland, and it seems clear that the actor who had maintained life-long links with the court of Poland, and whose wife was granted a royal pension to live in Danzig when he died in Warsaw under the stage name Pickelhering in 1642, was not Reynolds, but George Vincent.

Mundy's Pickelhering performs in Dutch. In suggesting a possible explanation for the strange features of Hals's sitter, Mundy's description is of specific relevance to the question of whether Hals portrayed a Dutch amateur or an English professional: 'Tt is said off him thatt hee could soe Frame his Face & countenance thatt to one hallffe off the people on the one side, hee would seem heartily to laugh, and to those on the other side bitterly to weepe & shedd teares, straunge.'⁵⁶

The facility for manipulating facial expressions and emotional responses was explored to new limits by early modern professional performers. The entry scene of Shakespeare's *Launce* is an extended solo involving the comic demonstration of half a dozen different styles of weeping, copiously punctuated by his own.⁵⁷ *Necrobaptista*, a play of 1600 written, according to its North German schoolmaster author Hector Conradus, in the style of the travelling players, opens with the clown Claus Narr punctuating an extended laughing fit by demonstrating different types of laughter.⁵⁸ The substitution of weeping for laughter and vice versa, a stock in trade of Tiberio Fiorillo (1608–94), creator of the role of Scaramouche, was perhaps influenced by the early modern fascination for Democritus and Heraclitus, the laughing and weeping philosophers.⁵⁹ Some have tried to identify a female counterpart to *Peeckelhaering*.⁶⁰ Instead, it may be worth considering whether it was not intended as a pendant to the pointing *So-Called Mulatto*, in the manner of the laughing Democritus, and weeping Heraclitus. Broadsheets inform readers that Jean Potage (the stage clown created by Thomas Sackville) accentuates his foolishness by crying despite not being sad, and then laughing again; and of Pickelhering's effortless ability to frame his features into a thousand expressions.⁶¹ The specific variation of Mundy's 'Pickled Herring' on the theme of facial dexterity, namely the simultaneous combination of laughing and weeping, is alluded to by the Pickelharing of Gryphius' Shakespeare-inspired play of 1658, *Peter Squentz*, as a trademark of Jehan Potage.⁶² Hals,

an acutely observant portraitist, depicts a Pickelhering whose unsymmetrical facial features give a disconcerting edge to his superficially jovial expression. If his unusual expression depicts the simultaneous weeping (on the right-hand half of his face) and laughing (on the left), of Mundy's 'Pickled Herring', his most plausible identity is George Vincent, the probable creator of the role.

Another important group of pictures linked to Hals with possible connections to the English players centres on the lost dated *Merry Trio* of 1616, thought to be privately owned in America, and the similarly dated Metropolitan Museum's *Shrovetide Revellers*. Gudlaugsson, accepting Poensgen's attribution of the lost Berlin variant of *Merry Trio* as a copy by Willem Buytewech after Hals's original, recognized its carnival revellers as depictions of performers, and identified its seated male as the northern stage fool Hanswurst.⁶³ *Shrovetide Revellers'* modern title is based on the inscription 'Vastenavonts-gasten', on the verso of Mathys van den Bergh's ink copy of 1660, which, although produced within Hals's lifetime, post-dates his original by over four decades. Slive has suggested that the principal models of *Shrovetide Revellers* may be actors, either itinerants or local amateurs.⁶⁴ Its half-length seated couple is flanked by two standing males. Slive identifies the seated male as Pickelhering, his partner as a possible cross-dressed actor, and the right-hand male (whose dress actually does resemble Pickelhering's pom-pom buttoned costume) as Hanswurst.⁶⁵ Behind the four main characters, the heads of five further males, their features distorted by alcoholic excesses, are compressed into the background shadows, forming a grisaille-like upper border to the composition. Until the painting was cleaned in 1951, these five heads were painted out, and the explicit gesture of the right-hand male was obliterated with the addition of a walking stick. These alterations bowdlerized a rumbustiously vulgar carnival celebration, softening its explicit theatrical connections and moralistic overtones into a blander genre scene, innocuously referred to by nineteenth-century specialists as *A Merry Supper Party*. The lower border is marked by a table bearing bagpipes and a range of foods and drinks associated with Lent (such as oysters and bread) and with carnival (such as sausages, pancakes and beer). The seated male wears a black hat garnished with a pipe, and a black outfit with a simple white ruff, decorated with an elaborate garland of typical foods of carnival (such as sausages, eggs and pig's trotters) and of Lent (such as oysters, legumes and cured herrings, from which Pickelhering takes his name). These herrings are not salted or pickled but a type of kipper (the Dutch *bokking* or German *Bückling*) that was traditional Dutch Lenten fare. The painting pre-dates the generic spread of the Pickelhering role. The bearded seated male, with his distinctive black costume and wart under his right eye, also features in *Merry Trio*, where his partner's low neckline identifies her as unmistakably female. In *Shrovetide Revellers*, the equivalent figure is flat-chested and coarse-featured, with a disturbingly

knowing expression, a flushed complexion indicative of alcoholic excess or heavy make-up, outsize hands and more than a hint of an adam's apple. Professional English troupes did not introduce on-stage women before the 1650s, so if the painting depicts English actors, then it provides a very rare portrait of a seventeenth-century cross-dressed English boy actor.

Of what relevance are the activities of the English players in the Low Countries to the oeuvre of Frans Hals and his followers? As previous generations of artists drew on court fools, seventeenth-century Dutch artists turned to itinerant comic actors, and specifically their popular stage fools, as personifications of certain sinful characteristics, notably folly, deceitfulness and greed. Pickelhering's association with folly was further heightened by the perceived aphrodisiac and alcohol-imbibing effects of cured herrings.⁶⁶ Hals's portraits of Pickelhering inspired many artists. They form the basis for the wine-pourer at the centre of the Stockholm Nationalmuseum's *Banquet Scene* of 1639 by his brother Dirck Hals, and the mountebank's stage fool in Edward Le Davis's *The Mountebank Doctor and his Merry Andrew*. This late seventeenth-century engraving, one of the earliest English prints based on the paintings of Frans Hals, is a pastiche of two unconnected portraits by Hals, the *So-Called Mulatto* (Figure 9.2) and a portrait now in the Hermitage.⁶⁷ Perhaps the artist whose works most clearly illustrate the iconographic significance of English stage fools, and especially Pickelhering, is Jan Steen. *Peeckelhaering* itself, possibly once owned by Steen, is prominent amongst portraits of itinerant and marginal characters by Hals featured in the backgrounds of some of Steen's interiors. In the Wellington Museum's *Physician's Visit*, Steen gives us his version of the popular subject of the lovesick girl attended by her physician. He rejects unsophisticated old-fashioned iconographic devices for drawing attention to the girl's illness, and its foolish nature, such as including an actual Cupid or Fool in the scene. Instead, Steen has found naturalistic solutions that powerfully evoked their symbolic presence to spectators of his day: the child with his toy bow and arrow, and a painting of a stage fool. This latter is Hals's *Peeckelhaering*, included as a picture within a picture hanging on the wall directly behind the lovesick girl, filling the top right-hand corner of Steen's canvas.

The *Physician's Visit* is not the only painting by Steen in which *Peeckelhaering* personifies folly. In the background of the Berlin *Christening Feast*, of c. 1660, it is the right-hand one of three paintings depicted as hanging on the back wall (Figure 9.3). Its pendant, to the left of a large landscape, is based on Hals's *Malle Babbe*. The sheet of paper lying in front of the newly christened baby's crib is inscribed with a Dutch proverb ('The young will sing to the same tune as their elders'). Here every generation of the living are gathered together to celebrate the family's newest arrival. They are presided over, not by believable representations of ancestral portraits, but by portraits of two



9.3 Jan Steen, 'So de Oude songen, so pypen de Jongen' (The Christening Feast), oil on canvas, 83 × 99 cm, signed, c. 1660

characters nominated by Steen as an explicit gloss on what he sees as this family's moral and spiritual deficiencies. Malle Babbe and Pickelhering are not casual inclusions. The foolish connotations of these disreputable marginals is enhanced by Malle Babbe's owl and by Pickelhering's fool's costume. Steen's intention in coupling the pair is linked to the proverb spelled out in his picture. They are the symbolic *pater* – and *mater* – *familias* of his celebrating clan, a potent comment on the origins of their foolish and sinful behaviour. Steen's iconographic recycling of Hals's portraits of marginals remind us of their powerful symbolic connotations. But Malle Babbe and Pickelhering are not generic pastiches. Malle Babbe, popularly regarded as the semi-mythic 'witch of Haarlem', was no fantasy of Hals's imagination, but a woman personally known to him. A document of 1653, recording her confinement to the Haarlem house of correction, establishes her as a fellow citizen of Hals's own home town.⁶⁸

Underpinning the arguments presented here is the assumption that no less than his commissioned depictions of paying clients, Hals's portraits of marginals are accurate, penetrating records of historically identifiable individuals. Like Malle Babbe, the sitters of *Peeckelhaering*, *So-Called Mulatto*, *Young Man with a Skull*, *Shrovetide Revellers* and *Merry Trio* were personally known to Hals.

Societal disapproval of performers extended even to depictions of them. They were considered so much less desirable than other categories of portraiture or genre that, as in the case of *Shrovetide Revellers*, some owners altered their titles, or went to even further lengths to obliterate their theatrical connections. Hals's paintings are now recognized as depicting performers, and have been linked with Dutch amateur actors. Contextualization within the activities of the English players in Europe lends weight to their identification as portraits of specific English actors. The fact that they have no obvious iconographic precedents enhances their theatre-historical interest. It suggests that they may have the rare distinction of being depictions of stock theatrical characters that draw primarily not on the extant iconographic records, but on the very actors responsible for playing, in some case even creating, these roles. The oeuvre of Frans Hals represents a previously disregarded iconographic source for English comedians in the Netherlands, and further researches into their activities will throw new light on his enigmatic portraits of stage performers.

Notes

1. For Kathleen Barker. My thanks to The Open University, the Trustees of the Barbara Wilkes Fellowship and Elizabeth Howe Fund, The Society for Theatre Research (Kathleen Barker Award), Arts and Humanities Research Council and Herzog August Bibliothek for supporting this research, and to Tom Nichols and the delegates of the 2003 Aberdeen *Picturing Poverty* conference for helpful comments. Also to the following for permission to reproduce photographs: The National Gallery, London; Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig; Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie. Otherwise unattributed translations are mine. For theatre-historical contextualization of this subject, see M. A. Katritzky, 'Pickelhering and Hamlet in Dutch art: the English comedians of Robert Browne, John Green and Robert Reynolds', *Shakespeare Yearbook* 15, 2005, 113–40, published without author's proof corrections.
2. 14 Elizabeth I, cap.5, 1572, reprinted in: R. H. Tawney and Eileen Power (eds), *Tudor Economic Documents*, II (London, 1924), pp. 328–9.
3. Walter W. Greg (ed.), *Henslowe Papers, being Documents Supplementary to Henslowe's Diary* (London, 1907), p. 33. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1951), vol. 2, p. 287.
4. Christopher Balme, 'Interpreting the pictorial record: theatre iconography and referential dilemma', *Theatre Research International* 22 (1997), 190–201, 193–4.
5. Allardyce Nicoll, *The World of Harlequin* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 2–5.
6. Anthony Holden, *William Shakespeare, An Illustrated Biography* (London, 2002).
7. Seymour Slive, *Frans Hals* (London, 1989), pp. 208–11.
8. National Gallery visitor information label, 2003: 'This painting is not a portrait, but is intended as a *vanitas*, a reminder of the transience of life and the certainty of death. The subject of a young man holding a skull belongs to a well-established Netherlandish tradition, and can be traced back to engravings of the early 16th century. The exotic

- clothing recalls that used by the Utrecht Caravaggisti.' Alan Young, 'Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century visual representations of the graveyard scene in *Hamlet*', in Hardin Aasand (ed.), *Stage Directions in 'Hamlet'* (London, 2003), pp. 189–213, esp. 191, 210.
9. Seymour Slive, *Frans Hals*, 3 vols (London, 1970–74) (vol. 1: 'Text', 1970; vol. 2: 'Plates', 1970; vol. 3: 'Catalogue', 1974), 'Text', p. 88; also Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), p. 208.
 10. Slive, 'Text', p. 88; 'Catalogue', p. 37; Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), p. 208.
 11. Barber Institute, Birmingham.
 12. The three fundamental texts of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, all published in London, are the First Quarto or Q1 of 1603 (*The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke By William Shake-speare. As it hath bene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the Cittie of London: as also in the two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where*), the Second Quarto or Q2 of 1604, of which some copies are dated 1605 (*The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke By William Shakespeare. Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie.*) and the version included in the First Folio or F1 of 1623 (*Mr William Shakespeares Comedies, histories, & tragedies. Published according to the True Originall Copies*). 'Chop-fallen' (literally: with the lower jaw dropped or missing, *Hamlet*, Vi, F1 only) means dejected, down-cast or crestfallen.
 13. Hardin Aasand, ' "Pah! Puh!": Hamlet, Yorick, and the chopless stage direction', in H Aasand (ed.), *Stage Directions in 'Hamlet'* (London, 2003), p. 214.
 14. Literally, 'chamber of rhetoric'; but came to mean 'amateur dramatic society'.
 15. Christiane Stukenbrock, *Frans Hals – Fröhliche Kinder, Musikanten und Zecher. Eine Studie zu ausgewählten Motiogruppen und deren Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Frankfurt-a-M, 1993), pp. 138, 143.
 16. Slive, 'Text', p. 88.
 17. Katritzky, 'Pickelhering and Hamlet'.
 18. Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS CCC94, pp. 470, 649; much-quoted from the abridged edition: *Shakespeare's Europe. Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's Itinerary*, edited by Charles Hughes (London, 1903).
 19. Balthasar Paumgartner and Magdalena Behaim (ed. Georg Steinhausen), *Briefwechsel Balthasar Paumgartners des Jüngeren mit seiner Gattin Magdalena, Geb. Behaim (1582–1598)* (Tübingen, 1895), pp. 176–7.
 20. J. G. Riewald, 'New light on the English actors in the Netherlands, c. 1590–c. 1660', *English Studies* 41 (1960), 81; George Brandt and Wiebe Hogendoorn, *German and Dutch Theatre, 1600–1848* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 379, 399.
 21. Harry R. Hoppe, 'English actors at Ghent in the seventeenth century', *Review of English Studies* 25 (1949), 313; Riewald, 'New light on the English actors', 82.
 22. Unless there is a connection between the play in John Green's 1608 repertoire described in Archduchess Maria Magdalena's 'Theaterbrief' as 'ein Comedi [...] von den 2 priedern Chünig ludwig und khünig friderich von ungern; ist ein erschrockhliche Comedi gewest, ein so hats der khünig Friederich alß erstochen und ermördt' ('a play of the two brothers King Ludwig and King Friedrich of Hungary, it was a frightening play, in which King Friedrich stabbed and murdered everyone') and *Der bestrafte Brudermord*. Green's play is the only one of the ten described by Maria Magdalena that remains unidentified: Ralf Haekel, *Die englischen Komödianten in Deutschland. Eine Einführung in die Ursprünge des deutschen Berufsschauspiels* (Heidelberg, 2004), pp. 110–111: 'es ist kein entsprechendes Drama bekannt'.
 23. Marshall Blakemore Evans, *Der bestrafte Brudermord, sein Verhältnis zu Shakespeares Hamlet* (Hamburg and Leipzig, 1910), pp. 45–9; Simon Williams, *Shakespeare on the German Stage*, vol. 1: 1586–1914 (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 35–9, 43–5. Haekel (*Die englischen Komödianten*, pp. 212–223) summarizes the field.
 24. S. J. Gudlaugsson, *De komedianten bij Jan Steen en zijn Tijdgenooten* (The Hague, 1945), pp. 58–61.
 25. Slive, 'Catalogue', pp. 40–41, gives details of numerous variants, including a near identical replica of the Kassel painting then in a private collection in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, now sold on the New York art market, and a dated engraving of 1648. On P. Biesboer's dating to c. 1645–55, see Stukenbrock, *Frans Hals*, p. 151.
 26. Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), p. 216, fig. 31a.

27. Gudlaugsson, *De komedianten bij Jan Steen*, pp. 59–61; Slive, 'Text', p. 34; Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), p. 216; Stukenbrock, *Frans Hals*, p. 151.
28. Brandt and Hogendoorn, *German and Dutch Theatre*, pp. 369–70.
29. Slive, 'Text', p. 34; Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), pp. 138, 216; John Alexander, 'The Dutch connection: on the social origins of the Pickelhering', *Neophilologus* 87 (2003), 602.
30. Haekel, *Die englischen Komödianten*, p. 236.
31. Quoted by Albert Cohn in *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Wiesbaden, 1967 [facsimile of the 1865 edition]), p. xcvi: 'Diesen Monsieur Pickelhaering haben die Engländerischen erstmalen in Deutschland eingeführt, da es noch in guten Wohlstand war, und jedermann gerne mit Comoedien und anderen Aufzügen sich belustiget'.
32. Friedrich Menius, *Tragedien, das ist: Sehr Schöne / herrliche vnd ausserlesene / geist- vnd weltliche Comedi und Tragedi Spiel / Sampt dem Bickelhering / Welche wegen ihrer artigen Inventionen, kurtzweilige[n] auch theils warhafftige[n] Geschicht halber / vo[n] den Engelländern in Deutschland / an Königlichen / Chur- vnd Fürstlichen Höfen / auch in vornehmen Reichs- See- vnd HandelStädten seynd agiret vnd gehalten worden / vnd zuvor nie im Druck außgangen* (1624) (1st edn, 1620). Gustaf Fredén's author attribution is generally accepted (Friedrich Menius und das Repertoire der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland (Stockholm, 1939), p. 4.
33. Gregor J. M. Weber, ' "t Lof van den Pekelharingh". Von alltäglichen und absonderlichen Heringsstilleben', *Oud Holland* 101 (1987), 139.
34. Johannes Bolte, *Die Singspiele der englischen Komödianten und ihrer Nachfolger in Deutschland, Holland und Skandinavien* (Hamburg and Leipzig, 1893), pp. 4, 27–8, 177.
35. Weber, ' "t Lof van den Pekelharingh", 137.
36. Fredén, *Friedrich Menius*, p. 199; Otto Schindler, ' "Sonst ist es lustig alhie". Italienisches Theater am Habsburgerhof zwischen Weißem Berg und Sacco di Mantova', in Andreas Weigl (ed.), *Wien im Dreißigjährigen Krieg* (Vienna, 2001), pp. 611–2, 615.
37. Otto Schindler, ' "Mio compadre Imperatore", Comici dell'arte an den Höfen der Habsburger', *Maske und Kothurn* 38 (1997), 54; Otto Schindler, ' "Englischer Pickelhering – gen Prag jubilierend". Englische Komödianten als Wegbereiter des deutschen Theaters in Prag', in A. Jakubcová, J. Ludvová and V. Maidl (eds), *Deutschsprachiges Theater in Prag* (Prag, 2001), p. 86.
38. Günther Hansen (posthumously edited by Helmut Asper), *Formen der Commedia dell'Arte in Deutschland* (Emsdetten, 1984), pp. 39–41; Willem Schrickx, *Foreign Envoys and Travelling Players in the Age of Shakespeare and Jonson* (Wetteren, 1986), pp. 227–30.
39. Schrickx, *Foreign Envoys and Travelling Players*, pp. 234–8.
40. N. W. Bawcutt, 'William Vincent, alias Hocus Pocus: a travelling entertainer of the seventeenth century', *Theatre Notebook* 54 (2000), 131–33; Philip Butterworth, 'Brandon, Feats and Hocus Pocus: jugglers three', *Theatre Notebook* 57 (2003), 98.
41. Johannes Bolte, *Das Danziger Theater im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg and Leipzig, 1895), p. 47: 'so wie wier einen zimlichen wegk von Wolffenbüttel anhero, dieser Hochberümbten Stadt [=Danzig] zu sonderm ehren, schleünig gereiset'.
42. Katritzky, 'Pickelhering and Hamlet', fig. 4.
43. R. A. Foakes, 'Playhouses and players', in A. R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 1990), 44.
44. Johannes Meissner, *Die Englischen Comoedianten zur Zeit Shakespeares in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1884), p. 80: 'der mensch im langen roten hare, der alleweil das khlein geigell geigt'.
45. Willem Schrickx, ' "Pickelhering" and English actors in Germany', *Shakespeare Survey* 36 (1983), 138.
46. Katritzky, 'Pickelhering and Hamlet', figs. 4 and 5.
47. Jerzy Limon, *Gentlemen of a Company, English Players in Central and Eastern Europe 1590–1660* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 100–102.

48. Riewald, 'New light on the English actors', 89–90; Schrickx, '“Pickleherring” and English actors in Germany', 140; Limon, *Gentlemen of a Company*, p. 101; Schrickx, *Foreign Envoys and Travelling Players*, p. 228.
49. Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, pp. 94–5.
50. C. F. Meyer, 'Englische Komödianten am Hofe des Herzogs Philipp Julius von Pommern-Wolgast', *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft* 38 (1902), 210; J. G. Riewald, 'Some later Elizabethan and early Stuart actors and musicians', *English Studies* 40 (1959), 36; Schrickx, *Foreign Envoys and Travelling Players*, p. 238.
51. Danzig.
52. Königsberg (now Kaliningrad).
53. Peter Mundy, *Itinerarium Mundii*, MS Rawl. A.315, fol.202r; Bodleian Library, Oxford. Limon, (*Gentlemen of a Company*, p. 105) and Schrickx (*Foreign Envoys and Travelling Players*, p. 238) quote this passage from the reprint (London, 1925, vol. 4, p. 181–2).
54. Limon, *Gentlemen of a Company*, p. 105; Schrickx, *Foreign Envoys and Travelling Players*, pp. 238–9; Ben Albach, 'Pekelharing, personage en potsenmaker', *Literatuur* 7 (1990), 74–5.
55. Riewald, 'New light on the English actors', 84–6.
56. Mundy, *Itinerarium Mundii*, fol.202r.
57. *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, II. iii.
58. Gustaf Fredén, '“Those that play your clowns ...” Clowns on the Shakespearian stage and in the plays of the English comedians in Germany', *Moderna Språk* 58 (1964), 318.
59. Maria Ines Aliverti, 'An unknown portrait of Tiberio Fiorilli', *Theatre Research International* 23 (1998), 129–30.
60. Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), p. 220.
61. Katritzky, 'Pickelhering and Hamlet', figs. 4–6.
62. Andreas Gryphius, 'Absurda comica oder Herr Peter Squentz', in Andreas Gryphius (ed. Hermann Palm), *Lustspiele* (Hildesheim, 1961), p. 17.
63. Gudlaugsson, *De komedianten bij Jan Steen*, pp. 57–8.
64. Slive, 'Text', p. 34. Slive ('Catalogue', pp. 3–4, 115–16) notes variants, including several to *Merry Trio* in addition to the destroyed Berlin one, of which he does not note the colour reproduction (Edgcumbe Staley, *Frans Hals* (London, s.d.), plate III, as by Dirk Hals).
65. Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), pp. 2, 166, 216.
66. Weber, '“’t Lof van den Pekelharingh”', 133.
67. Slive, *Frans Hals* (1989), pp. 216–223.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

In Search of the Marginal and the Outcast: The 'Lower Orders' in the Cries of London and Dublin

Sean Shesgreen

Cries, defined as street characters pictured in likenesses with captions recording their shouts, trades, or identities,¹ is the only genre in art to take as its object the urban poor, those invisible men and women Edmund Burke described as working 'from dawn to dark in the innumerable servile, degrading, unseemly, unmanly and often most unwholesome and pestiferous occupations, to which by the social economy so many wretches are inevitably doomed.'² In life and art, these 'lower sort of people' include a broad expanse of urban characters, stretching from valued and sentimentalized proletarians like milkmaids and balladeers to prostitutes, gamblers, thieves, and political or religious renegades, who fall outside the pale of respectable society, even at its bottom. The structural commitment of Cries to 'low-born, servile' men and women goes back to the first example, the *Cries of Paris*, cut about 1500; it continues in images appearing up to 1900, when the genre vanishes and the task of tracking the marginal is taken up by sociologists.³ Cries, adding up to pictorial inventories of urban street traders but quickly expanding to include city characters of all types, come in four formats: broadsides, oil paintings, children's books, and ensembles of prints; the last, the most popular and formally complex, are my focus in this essay. Ensembles exist for large and small cities of Europe, including (in the three kingdoms) London, York, Glasgow and Dublin.

Though Cries, by definition, illustrate the lack of money, class, power and status among the disadvantaged, they have been overlooked as sources of information about commoners. Finding information about the lives of the urban working classes – especially women, who are often doubly invisible – and about their distinctive material culture – the tubs, baskets and rag bags they used or the turnips, bog wood and 'Bullrudderie' cakes they sold – is

Others and Outcasts in Early Modern Europe

Picturing the Social Margins

Edited by Tom Nichols

ASHGATE

© Tom Nichols 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Tom Nichols has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the editor of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Gower House
Croft Road
Aldershot
Hampshire GU11 3HR
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington, VT 05401-4405
USA

Ashgate website: <http://www.ashgate.com>

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Others and outcasts in early modern Europe : picturing the social margins

1. Outsiders in art 2. Poor in art 3. Painting, European - 16th century 4. Painting, European - 17th century
5. Painting, European - 18th century

I. Nichols, Tom, 1958-
704.9'4930556

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Others and outcasts in early modern Europe : picturing the social margins / edited by Tom Nichols.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-7546-5557-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Poor in art. 2. Sick in art. 3. Outsiders in art. 4. Peddlers and peddling in art. 5. Art, European--Themes, motives. I. Nichols, Tom, 1958-

N8236.P69O74 2007
704.9'49305568094--dc22

2006030605

ISBN: 978-0-7546-5557-2

Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall.

Contents

<i>Figures</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Contributors</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xv</i>
 Introduction <i>Tom Nichols</i>	 1
 Section One: Others and Outcasts in Northern Art of the Sixteenth Century	
1 Picturing Antichrist and Others in the Prado <i>Epiphany</i> by Hieronymus Bosch <i>Debra Higgs Strickland</i>	11
2 The Vagabond Image: Depictions of False Beggars in Northern Art of the Sixteenth Century <i>Tom Nichols</i>	37
 Section Two: Imagery of the Deserving and Institutionalized Poor in Italian Art	
3 Poor Substitutes: Imaging Disease and Vagrancy in Renaissance Venice <i>Philip Cottrell</i>	63
4 Poverty and Papal Piety in Rome c. 1600: Painting, Pastoralism and Spectacle <i>Peter Higginson</i>	87

5	Blindness, Lameness and Mendicancy in Italy (from the 14th to the 18th Centuries) <i>Livio Pestilli</i>	107
Section Three: Insiders/Outsiders: Visualizing the Social Margins		
6	The Caravaggesque Toothpuller <i>John Gash</i>	133
7	Relics of the Golden Age: the Vagabond Philosopher <i>Helen Langdon</i>	157
8	Constructing the Black Slave in Early Modern Spanish Painting <i>Carmen Fracchia</i>	179
9	'Some tymes J have a shillinge aday, and some tymes nothinge, so that J leve in great poverty': British Actors in the Paintings of Frans Hals <i>M. A. Katritzky</i>	197
10	In Search of the Marginal and the Outcast: The 'Lower Orders' in the Cries of London and Dublin <i>Sean Shesgreen</i>	215
	<i>Bibliography</i>	241
	<i>Index</i>	263

Figures

1 Picturing Antichrist and Others in the Prado *Epiphany* by Hieronymus Bosch

1.1 Hieronymus Bosch, *The Epiphany* triptych, open: donor with St Peter, *Adoration of the Magi*, donor with St Agnes, c. 1510–16, oil on panel, 138 × 144 cm, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid

1.2 *Adoration of the Magi*, central panel, *The Epiphany* triptych

1.3 Antichrist (detail), *Adoration of the Magi*, central panel, *The Epiphany* triptych

1.4 Hieronymus Bosch, *The Epiphany* triptych, closed: *Mass of St Gregory*, c. 1510–16, oil on panel, 138 × 72 cm

1.5 Adoration of Antichrist (detail), *Antichrist*, MS germ. f.733, fol. 4, Bavaria, c. 1440–50, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin

1.6 Black Magus and attendant (detail), *Adoration of the Magi*, central panel, *The Epiphany* triptych

1.7 Left army (detail), *Adoration of the Magi*, central panel, *The Epiphany* triptych

2 The Vagabond Image: Representing False Beggars in Northern Art of the Sixteenth Century

2.1 Anonymous frontispiece to the *Liber vagatorum: Der betler orden*, published by Johannes Weissenberger, c. 1510 (Nuremberg), woodcut, British Library no. C.53bb.9(4)

2.2 Anonymous frontispiece to the *Liber vagatorum: Der betler orden*, published by Jacob Schmidt, 1522 (Speyer), woodcut, British Library no. C.25 e.24

2.3 Hieronymus Bosch, *The Hay Wain* triptych, closed: *Wandering Vagabond*, c.1500–02, oil on panel, 140 × 100 cm, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid

2.4 Anonymous Netherlandish artist, *Je suy le poure Diable*, sixteenth century, engraving, Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam

2.5 Roelandt Savery, *Two Beggars*, 1600–10, drawing (pen and brown ink), 11.3 × 9.2 cm, Hessisches Landesmuseum, Darmstadt

2.6 Lucas van Leyden, *Beggars*, c. 1509–10, etching and engraving,

9.2 Frans Hals, *So-Called Mulatto*, oil on canvas, 75.5 × 64 cm, monogrammed, Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig

9.3 Jan Steen, 'So de Oude songen, so pypen de Jongen' (*The Christening Feast*), oil on canvas, 83 × 99 cm, signed, c. 1660, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Gemäldegalerie (795D), Staatliche Museen zu Berlin

10 In Search of the Marginal and Outcast: The 'Lower Orders' in the Cries of London and Dublin

10.1 Hugh Douglas Hamilton, 'Three Papist Criminals going to Execution', 1760, private collection, Ireland

10.2 Francis Wheatley, 'New Mackrel, New Mackrel', 1796, Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington IN

10.3 Paul Sandby, 'Rare Mackerel, Three a Groat or Four for Sixpence', c.1759, Nottingham Castle, Nottingham

10.4 Hugh Douglas Hamilton, title page, 1760, private collection, Ireland

10.5 Paul Sandby, title page to *Cries of London*, 1760, British Museum, London

10.6 L. P. Boitard, *Cries of London*, 1760, Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington IN

10.7 Paul Sandby, title page of 'Twelve London Cries Done from the Life', 1760, Lewis-Walpole Library, Yale University, Farmington CT

10.8 Paul Sandby, 'Turn your Copper into Silver now before your Eyes, Twelve London Cries done from the Life by P. Sandby', 1760, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, New Haven CT

10.9 Paul Sandby, 'The Peep-show, one of the figure sketches made in Edinburgh and the neighbourhood', c. 1747, British Museum, London

Contributors

PHILIP COTTRELL is a lecturer in the History of Art at University College, Dublin. His research has focused on Venetian painting, especially the paintings of Bonifacio de' Pitati and his followers. His published work includes articles and reviews in *Apollo*, *Art Bulletin*, *The Burlington Magazine* and *Venezia Cinquecento* dealing with associated issues of corporate patronage and professional identity in Venetian painting.

CARMEN FRACCHIA teaches art history in the School of Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Studies at Birkbeck College, University of London. She has published and has forthcoming a number of book contributions on early modern art in Spain and colonial Mexico. She is working on a monograph on representations of black people in early modern Spain.

JOHN GASH is a senior lecturer in the History of Art at the University of Aberdeen, and a specialist in the Baroque. He has published many articles and reviews in *The Burlington Magazine*, *Art History*, *Apollo* and other scholarly journals. He has also published two books on Caravaggio.

PETER HIGGINSON is a lecturer at Christie's Education, London, with a particular interest in early modern Rome. His doctoral dissertation, entitled *Poverty and Culture in Rome ca. 1600: Investigations into the Social Functions of Caravaggio's Poor Types* (2005) focused specifically on issues of poverty and culture. Published papers include 'Time and papal power: the pilgrim's experience of the old and new in early modern Rome', in A. Roesler-Friedenthal and J. Nathan (eds), *The Enduring Instant: Time and the Spectator in the Visual Arts* (Berlin, 2002).

DEBRA HIGGS STRICKLAND is Deputy Director of the Glasgow Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at the University of Glasgow and is an Honorary Fellow in Art History at Edinburgh University. Under the name

of Debra Hassig, she has published books and articles on various aspects of Romanesque and Gothic art, especially bestiaries. Her most recent book, *Saracens, Demons, and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 2003) examines negative images of a number of rejected groups, both real and imaginary, in relation to contemporary social attitudes and theological beliefs about the so-called enemies of Christendom.

M. A. KATRITZKY is the Wilkes Research Fellow in Theatre Studies at the Open University and a former fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt, Harold Hyam Wingate and Leverhulme Foundations, the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study, and the Herzog August Bibliothek. The European Science Foundation Theatre Iconography Network 1997–2001 was set up at her initiative, and she co-authored the first academic textbook on theatre iconography (*Picturing Performance: The Iconography of the Performing Arts in Concept and Practice*). Recent publications include *The art of commedia: a study in the commedia dell'arte 1560–1620 with special reference to the visual records* (Rodopi, 2006) and *Women, medicine and theatre: performing mountebanks 1500–1750* (Ashgate, 2007).

HELEN LANGDON was educated at the University of Cambridge and the Courtauld Institute of Art, and is an art historian with a special interest in the Italian baroque. Her books include *Claude Lorrain* (1989) and *Caravaggio: A Life* (1998). In 2000 she was the Paul Mellon Fellow at the British School at Rome, and in 2003 she was Assistant Director of the British School. She has been part of an AHRC-funded research project, 'Court Culture in Early Modern Rome 1450–1750', at the University of Edinburgh. In Spring 2006 she took up a scholarship at the Getty Institute in Los Angeles, where her project was 'Representations of Philosophers'.

TOM NICHOLS is a lecturer in art history at the University of Aberdeen. His monograph *Tintoretto, Tradition and Identity* was published by Reaktion Books (1999). Recent research has been focused on depictions of beggars in early modern Europe. A monograph, entitled *The Art of Poverty: Irony and Ideal in the Sixteenth-Century Beggar Image*, is forthcoming with Manchester University Press.

LIVIO PESTILLI is the Director of Trinity College/Rome Campus where he teaches Renaissance and Baroque art. He has published articles on a wide range of subjects, including Cavallini's mosaics in Santa Maria in Trastevere, Michelangelo's Rome *Pietà*, Michael Sweert's *Artist in His Studio* and Lord Shaftesbury's artistic theory and patronage. He is currently working on a book on representations of the disabled in Italian art from antiquity to the

eighteenth century, as well as on a monograph on the Neapolitan painter, Paolo de Matteis.

SEAN SHESGREEN is Distinguished Research Professor in English at Northern Illinois University. His articles have appeared in *Print Quarterly*, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, *The Harvard Library Bulletin* and *Word and Image*. His books include *Criers and Hawkers of London* (Stanford University Press and Ashgate, 1990) and *Images of the Outcast: The Urban Poor in the Cries of London* (Manchester and Rutgers University Presses, 2002).